March 4, 1968

Dear Harold,

You think Lee Harvey was an innocent bystander. The evidence really does not point either to his being an innocent bystander or a patsy. The number of possible patsies in Dallas that day was no doubt great! My whole theory is based on the fact that Oswald was a person who could be easily blackmailed. There are to my mind three possibilities: (1) an innocent bystander transformed into a patsy by sheer chance by the Dallas police dept., (2) he was a bystander who accidentally got caught up in the situation and was killed before his innocence was ever proved in a court of law, and (3) he was a hand picked patsy. His Trotskyite background was perhaps another mere chance affair but it is curious... Wouldn't it be smart to arrest a Trotskyite who could not be trusted to tell the truth?

Let us suppose that Oswald was lulled into blackmail and not brazenly blackmailed as the TV and movies have a tendency to portray it. Think of him as a scoptophilic who is very curious, like Russo, about extremist politics. [His curiosity in extreme politics has been fairly well demonstrated.] Let us then assume that he got to know some people out of this curiosity. Then consider the possibility that these people are the assassins of the President. Like Russo, a mal-

content, he is pulled into the discussions by circumstances. At first he looks on it all as a joke, then it becomes more serious. Now we can assume Oswald walked away without being killed and that due to these bad associations he was finally apprehended accidentally in Dallas, has old associates never knowing that he was even there. But if we have assumed that he has gotten into the organization it is not too hard to make another assumption based on the same degree of uncertainty, was he blackmailed to stay in the group? Wouldn't they use him and wouldn't they have the power to blackmail him if their authority was well defined and non-prosecutionable? In point of fact before they would ever dare talk to him he had to be trusted but better than trust, which today is insignificant, they got data on his past and were able to hold trump cards concerning his wife. From this vantage point they revealed peicemeal their plan. At each point he balks or is reserved. They slowly introduce their blackmail. First they use the job routine to get him to do some of their errands for various Cuban organizations, then by degrees he slides into a conciliatory role. As he becomes comfortable they raise the ante and blackmail him to the limit. They threaten to have his wife returned to Russia on some trumped up charges. He falls for it... Their nerve corresponds in each step

to his lack of nerve. He has already been tamed by the conservative F B I. The neo-fascists easily work on him psychologically.

Finally they even get him to reconnoiter the various speaking engagements of the President. And the Presidential route... He is strategically located and turned into a patsy. How did Oswald get a job at the Texas School Book Depository Building, a conservative city like Dallas!, when he had been fired so many times for his unpopular views? This is very interesting. The job could be a set-up, how long was he there before Kennedy arrived? Not very long.

A Communist patsy has the sinister (Johnsonian?) touch, the mark of a master mind. Not the mark of a conservative agency of the gov/t or law abiding citizens or one brand of fascism or another. It has that special Johnson touch to it. There is a bit of irony in the fact that a self expressed Trotskyite should kill a non self expressed Trotskyite... Working through the military or a neo-fascist group in military espionage would ensure secrecy... The military is over the barrel, they have no other straws to select, Johnson is eager to prove that he can make history...

Business: I did note in several of your books a tendency to use provocative headings which had a great deal to say for the fine tuned ear.

In these sanguine headings the path opened up very easily and eased the difficulty of the main work or facts. You left speculation to your reader... It was because of this that I said to you in my next to the last letter that the gov/t and H. Weisberg were not very speculative. The gov/t for its reasons and you for yours. By no means did I intend to suggest to you that your reasons were not more valid than the gov/t's! Yours are entirely understandable and I hope you did not get the wrong impression.

I fully realize your situation. I know what you want to do. I think you will do it. But I felt that a little prodding would not harm anyone. I gave you my ideas simply because I respected the person to whom I was talking. You do not have to explain to me your motives. I know you are after the truth. You are not like these other people who are out to defeat the Johnson administration and will simply pin it on him becuase of Veit-Nam so as to win the election against him... Such cynicism is unpardonable and I believe in your sincerity whilst disbelieving in most everyone elses motives in writing on the subject.

You are the Darwin on the subject. I am afraid that if you do not finish your book and get it out some punk will come along and murder the sub-

Dear Mrs. Weisberg,

Let me express my sorrow at your misfortune. A friend of mine, Mr. Pat Moore of Scotland, recently broke his & I know it put him out of his observatory some two months! Get well please.

Yours, P. K. Machal